

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 1, 1998

LB 1028

provides another 5 percent income tax cut on top of what we've provided last year, and the amendment that Senator Raikes brings us, I would choose addressing the inequity dealing with the marriage tax penalty first, and then the 5 percent additional cut, more than likely in the future. I believe the Raikes amendment can, in fact, fit into our current status. I have passed out, I believe it's a five-sheet colored set of financial status that I'd like the members to look at. I'm sure you'll be able to, if you...if you're familiar with our status, be able to see what we're...what we're looking at here. The green sheet is, of course, the continuation of the budget as presented in the budget document by the Appropriations Committee, continuing to spend at our...as projected. I think we need to look at that aspect of it during this debate as well as the projections on the revenue side. Now obviously, if we do nothing relative to the expenditure side of the status in the out years, we're looking at a \$185 million shortfall at the end of the second year. What I'd like for you to consider on the salmon-colored piece of paper is that if we can hold spending at the state level to 2.5 percent in each of the next two years, the second year we end up with a manageable \$65 million in the red without any other increase in the projections on the revenue side, which I think is manageable, and I think is applicable to Senator Raikes' amendment and that if this can fit, Senator Raikes' amendment can fit. The last sheet is if we were to adopt the perspective, the sense we are looking at increasing spending in the second year of our current biennium at about 13 percent, that if we froze spending for the next biennium, we in fact add \$100 million to our \$160 million Cash Reserve that's not touched by any of this. So I would ask for people to consider...

SENATOR BRASHEAR PRESIDING

SPEAKER BRASHEAR: One minute.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: ...that we look at the expenditure side of those out years as we have this discussion on how much further we can reduce income taxes for the taxpayers of this state. I would also indicate, if there's one thing that we have done that has driven the increase in spending is, in fact, tried to address the property tax circumstance of this state. We have \$170 million increase in property tax aid to local governments.